

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE  
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/PV.233  
15 September 1965  
ENGLISH

---

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Wednesday, 15 September 1965, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCU

(Romania)

OF MICHIGAN  
DEC 23 1965  
DOCUMENT  
COLLECTION

65-24501

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO  
Mr. D. SILVEIRA da MOTA

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LUKANOV  
Mr. Y. GOLEMANOV  
Mr. T. DAMIANOV  
Mr. I. BOEV

Burma:

U SAIN BWA  
U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS  
Mr. S.F. RAE  
Mr. C.J. MARSHALL  
Mr. P.D. LEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. Z. CERNIK  
Mr. V. VAJNAR  
Mr. F. DOBIAS

Ethiopia:

Lij M. IMRU  
Mr. A. ZELLEKE  
Mr. T. BEKELE

India:

Mr. V.C. TRIVEDI  
Mr. K.P. LUKOSE  
Mr. S.V. PURUSHOTTAM  
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI  
Mr. E. GUIDOTTI  
Mr. S. AVETTA  
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Mexico:

Mr. A. GOMEZ ROBLEDO

Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria:

Mr. L.C.N. OBI

Poland;

Mr. J. GOLDBLAT

Mr. E. STANIEWSKI

Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCU

Mr. N. ECOBESCU

Mr. C. UNGUREANU

Mr. P. MATEESCU

Sweden:

Mr. P. LIND

Mr. P. HAMMERSKJOLD

Mr. B. VEGESACK

Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics:

Mr. S.K. TSARAPKIN

Mr. Y.M. VORONTSOV

Mr. S.A. BOGOMOLOV

Mr. G.K. EFIMOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A.F. HASSAN

Mr. A. OSMAN

Mr. M. KASSEM

Mr. A.A. SALAM

United Kingdom:

Lord CHALFONT

Sir Harold BEELEY

Mr. J.G. TAHOURDIN

Miss E.J.M. RICHARDSON

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

Mr. C.H. TIMBERLAKE

Mr. D.S. MACDONALD

Mr. P.S. BRIDGES

Special Representative of the  
Secretary General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

The CHAIRMAN (Romania) (translation from French): I declare open the two hundred and thirty-third plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. GOMEZ ROBLEDO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): On behalf of the delegations of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and the United Arab Republic, I have the honour to submit the two memoranda (ENDC/158 and 159) in which we express our joint opinion on the two questions to which -- apart from that of general and complete disarmament -- the Disarmament Commission gave (DC/225; ENDC/149) the highest priority in transmitting them to us for study: namely the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and a comprehensive treaty banning all tests of such weapons. As these documents are now being circulated to the members of the Committee and time presses, I do not think it necessary to read them out. I will merely point out that, for the same reason, two or three minor errors have crept into the text; they will be corrected in the revised version of the documents (ENDC/158\*, 159\*) which the Secretariat will distribute in due course. These are very minor corrections, I repeat, which do not affect the substance of the documents in any way.

The delegations of the eight countries, in formally requesting that both documents be incorporated in the report on the current session, express the hope that the appeal which we are making will meet with a favourable reception in this Committee now and in public opinion afterwards. It is actually a single appeal -- although it is manifold owing to the diversity of its objectives -- for a brake to be put, once and for all, to the increase and spread of nuclear weapons.

Comment on these memoranda here and now seems to me to be inappropriate or at least unnecessary. They are before you as a vivid expression of the anxiety and outcry of the peoples and of peace-loving men in the dramatic times in which we are living. It is in this spirit that we offer them for your consideration.

Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): First let me say that my delegation welcomes the two memoranda which the representative of Mexico has put before us on behalf of his seven colleagues and himself. Our views with regard to a moratorium or

an uninspected suspension of tests are well known, of course. However, these memoranda certainly deserve full consideration, and I can assure him that the United States delegation will give them careful study. Also I agree -- as I am sure my co-Chairman will -- that they should be included in the final report.

I should like to speak briefly for a moment on another subject. Yesterday the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. Hassan, objected (ENDC/PV.232, pp.24, 25) a statement which I made at the 231st meeting of this Committee. At that meeting I said:

"The Soviet representative has again today repeated his support for an unverified moratorium on small underground tests accompanied by a treaty banning tests above a seismic magnitude of 4.75." (ENDC/PV.231, p.38)

I went on to say that this would constitute an uninspected comprehensive test ban and was therefore not a new Soviet position. It was in that context that I described it as an old Soviet proposal with a new label. My statement was addressed directly to the Soviet Union. Had I intended to address myself to the views of the United Arab Republic, I should have had to refer also to the third element included in its views -- namely, the belief that an exchange of scientific information might be helpful. That element, of course, was ignored by the Soviet representative. I am happy to see that it is mentioned in one of the memoranda (ENDC/159) circulated today.

Mr. HASSAN (United Arab Republic): I will not take up much time. I merely want to thank the representative of the United States, Mr. Foster, for the clarification he has just given. I think the misunderstanding has now been cleared up.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I should merely like to state that the documents (ENDC/158, 159) which have been submitted to the Committee this morning represent in my opinion a contribution of very great -- I would even say exceptional -- importance. The Italian delegation will of course study them with the greatest attention and the most lively interest.

I think that the eight delegations, having submitted these documents at the penultimate meeting of this session, do not expect us to give immediate replies. I myself submitted a document (ENDC/157) yesterday and, since our session is drawing to a close, I emphasized that I could not ask the Committee to examine it immediately. On the other hand, it is clear that the eight delegations wish the ideas expressed in their documents to be transmitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations so that a wide discussion on the subject can take place there. Naturally, both personally and on behalf of the Italian delegation, I shall be very glad to co-operate with the eight delegations in order to ensure that their documents are discussed in New York, that they are examined with the greatest attention, and that they are then placed on the agenda of our Conference when it resumes its work.

As for the substance of the ideas expressed in the two documents, I can say at once that on the whole the Italian delegation welcomes them very warmly.

In regard to tests, the position of my delegation is well known. While very much desiring the cessation of all tests, we could not accept a moratorium without controls, should such controls be necessary. To reach common agreement whether and to what extent these controls are necessary, a scientific comparison is essential, and it seems to me that the document submitted by the delegations of the non-aligned countries recognizes this need. Naturally, if this idea could be put into practice, my delegation would be very happy to co-operate.

In regard to non-proliferation, the document of the eight delegations establishes a link between non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. In this respect it is well known that my delegation, while convinced that an agreement or an undertaking to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons must have priority, recognizes that such a link is expedient. The link is reasonable, justified and acceptable. I should add that this idea is the very basis of the proposal which we submitted yesterday.

That proposal is not mentioned in the documents of the eight delegations. Indeed I must apologize to those eight delegations for having submitted our text so late that quite naturally the delegations of the non-aligned countries did not have time to take it into account in preparing their documents. But I know, as I mentioned yesterday,

the favourable reception accorded to Mr. Fanfani's idea (ENDC/PV.219, pp.18, 19) by the majority of the non-aligned delegations here present, and I am sure that our appeal -- which was addressed to all the non-aligned countries which are really anxious to avert the danger of proliferation -- will be heeded and acted upon by the non-nuclear delegations.

It appears to me that some passages of the document submitted today (ENDC/158) stress the desire to stop the spread of nuclear weapons as a matter of urgency, but at the same time the desirability -- indeed the need -- for the nuclear countries to take further steps towards their own nuclear disarmament. That shows that, although the eight delegations of the non-aligned countries have not mentioned our proposal, they have nevertheless taken up the idea on which it is based. I hope that, on the basis of that document, the delegations of the non-aligned countries which are here at Geneva will co-operate with us in the United Nations in order that we may fulfil our hopes of achieving as soon as possible a general treaty on non-dissemination or, if that is not possible, concrete and binding undertakings based mainly on the goodwill of the non-nuclear Powers but also on the determination of the nuclear countries to put an end to the nuclear arms race immediately.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): In regard to the memoranda submitted at today's meeting by the eight non-aligned States, one on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (ENDC/158) and the other on the question of a comprehensive test-ban treaty (ENDC/159), I can say that we shall study these two documents in the most careful manner. These documents contain certain constructive ideas which in many respects coincide with the position taken by the Soviet Union on these questions. Of course we shall study these two documents very thoroughly. We think that in further discussions on these questions these memoranda are likely to play a positive and constructive role. As co-Chairman, I agree that an appropriate reference to these memoranda should be included in the report to be submitted to the General Assembly, and that they should appear as annexes to the report.



Lord CHALFONT (United Kingdom): I should just like, very briefly, to welcome the memoranda that have been tabled this morning by the representatives of the non-aligned countries. One of the most valuable features of this Committee is the opportunity it gives to the non-aligned delegations to provide a series of thoughtful and constructive contributions to the dialogue that must go on between East and West. These memoranda are the latest in this series of distinguished contributions. Quite clearly a great deal of thought and concern has gone into formulating them. I should like, obviously, to have the opportunity later of commenting on the substance of the memoranda; but for the moment I would simply follow my colleagues in this Committee by saying that Her Majesty's Government will give both memoranda the very careful attention that they clearly deserve.

Mr. TRIVEDI (India): With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words on the draft report of the Committee (ENDC/156). We are grateful to the co-Chairmen for the work they have put into this draft. The Indian delegation is in general agreement with it, but feels that it may be necessary to make some small changes. As is known, before we assembled in this Committee we had the meeting of the Disarmament Commission in New York. We met there for nearly two months and debated various issues on disarmament in a thorough and businesslike manner. It was a very constructive debate, and one of the Commission's resolutions in particular recommended that we should reconvene as early as possible. I find that the draft report, admirable as it is, does not give sufficient prominence to that particular idea.

I think that, subject to the agreement of the co-Chairmen and the other members of the Committee, in the very first paragraph, or at the end of the first paragraph and before the present second paragraph, we could add a sentence of this nature:

"The Committee had before it, in particular, the Disarmament Commission's resolution of 15 June 1965 (DC/225; ENDC/149) recommending the reconvening of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and making certain specific suggestions regarding negotiations on general and complete disarmament and collateral measures".

That sentence either could be added at the place I have indicated or, if the co-Chairmen and the other members of the Committee felt that it should be at some other place, it could be used at the end of the second paragraph of Part III of the draft report where reference is made to this resolution, as follows:

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

"... and document DC/225, containing the text of the resolution adopted by the Disarmament Commission on 15 June 1965 which made certain specific recommendations to the Committee". (ENDC/156, p. 2)

It is there, perhaps, that the phraseology I have just used could be inserted. For example, in the last sentence of that paragraph we could say:

"... adopted by the Disarmament Commission on 15 June 1965, recommending the reconvening of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and making certain specific suggestions regarding negotiations on general and complete disarmament and collateral measures" --

exactly as I read it out just now.

The Indian delegation would prefer to have this phrase added to the first or the second paragraph; but we have no strong views on the matter. If the co-Chairmen and the other members of the Committee felt that it could just as well find its place where it is in the present draft, we should have no objection. That is the first comment I have to make.

Secondly, we find that, as is traditional, we have divided the report into part I, part II, part III and so on. Now, part II refers to general and complete disarmament and part III to collateral measures. We have ourselves said that we have not devoted very much time to general and complete disarmament, and in fact during this series of meetings of the Disarmament Committee we have not devoted, as we usually do, one day to general and complete disarmament and another day to collateral measures; we have discussed them together. I think it would reflect our work more faithfully if we were to combine these two parts in our report on this particular session. In other words, part II of the report could be headed: "General and Complete Disarmament and Measures Aimed at the Lessening of International Tension ..." etc. Apart from the fact that it would reflect faithfully the method of our working and the actual work we have done, it would also be logical from the point of view of the statements we have made in part III.

At the foot of page 3 of the draft report we have said:

"The Committee did not reach any specific agreement at this session either on questions of general and complete disarmament or on measures aimed at the lessening of international tension." (ENDC/156, p. 3)

That comes in part III, the heading of which covers collateral measures and which does not deal with general and complete disarmament. It is proper that we should have this sentence, but I think it would find its appropriate place if we were to combine the

(Mr. Trivedi, India)

headings of those two parts and make them into one part. It is not a very substantive amendment, but I am putting it forward to elicit the comments of the co-Chairmen and our colleagues.

If we were to combine those two parts, then perhaps the first sentence in the present part III might need some consequential verbal change. The sentence **reads** at **present**: "The Committee, in its efforts to achieve and implement ...". We could probably change that to read: "In its efforts to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date, the Committee continued consideration ...", because it would tie in with the preceding paragraph in the same part.

Those are the only two suggestions I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OBI (Nigeria): I have been requested by the other non-aligned delegations to raise a point which is of great importance to the Committee and which, incidentally, is covered partly by the draft report which we are now discussing. I refer to the question of the reconvening of this Committee. The Committee will remember that I raised earlier (ENDC/PV.232, p. 28) the question of deciding on a specific date. The group of non-aligned delegations is of the view that it would be worth while if the co-Chairmen were to consider at least a flexible formula which would enable us to reconvene here as soon as possible.

In this connexion, therefore, I have been requested to ask the co-Chairmen to consider the desirability of amending that section of the draft report dealing with the subject: that is, part I, Procedural Arrangements, the relevant sentence reading -

"The Committee decided to resume its meetings in Geneva as soon as possible after the termination of the consideration of disarmament at the twentieth session of the General Assembly, on a date to be decided by the two co-Chairmen after consultation with the members of the Committee."

The very slight amendment we are suggesting would read:

"The Committee decided to resume its meetings in Geneva as soon as possible after the termination of the consideration of disarmament at the twentieth session of the General Assembly, ..."

and then we add:

"... preferably before the end of January 1966. The actual date could be decided by the two co-Chairmen after consultation with the members of the Committee."

As the Committee will see, it is a very flexible amendment we are proposing, and I sincerely trust that the two co-Chairmen will consider it and let us have their reaction as soon as possible.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): We have before us three amendments which seem to me to be most constructive and to which I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee in the hope that they will support them.

One of the amendments proposed by the representative of India is really a drafting amendment, since it is aimed at merging parts II and III. For my part, I have no objection. Indeed, I think that, for the drafting reasons explained by Mr. Trivedi, the amendment might be useful.

However, I attach particular importance to the other amendment moved by Mr. Trivedi, to include in the report a reference to the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission which preceded the present session of our Committee. It is well known that we all accepted with satisfaction the Soviet Union's proposal for the convening of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, precisely because we thought that the Commission might give our Committee instructions and advice. Its advice has largely been followed, and I think that it would be particularly logical to mention in our report the resolutions which were adopted by the Disarmament Commission without any opposition from the delegations here present, and which have in fact been to a large extent the basis of our work.

I think the proposal of the representative of Nigeria is a very constructive one, and I believe it meets the wishes of the great majority of the delegations here present. The wording suggested by Mr. Obi does not, of course, exclude the possibility of our returning to Geneva to resume our work even before the date indicated, but it lays down a very reasonable time limit. Indeed, by that time we shall know for certain that the debate in the United Nations has been concluded and that there is nothing to prevent us from resuming our work.

Moreover, I think that the insertion of a date in our report would be particularly useful and would serve as an indicator. Our session has been exceptionally short and it is obvious, as the draft report shows, that no concrete results have been achieved. It would therefore be quite appropriate to inform the General Assembly that we are suspending our work because of the forthcoming opening of its session—during which the question of disarmament will be discussed—but that it is our firm intention to resume our work without delay.

Mr. OBI (Nigeria): I thank the representative of Italy for his very kind remarks, but it may be that I did not make myself very clear. Much as I would like to claim the paternity of this suggestion, it was one made not by Nigeria alone or by myself in particular but by the eight -- on whose behalf I spoke. I should just like to set the record straight on that point.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): The amendments suggested by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the non-aligned delegations, as well as the second amendment suggested by the representative of India, are more or less clear to us. With regard to the first amendment suggested by the representative of India, however, we should like that to be circulated in writing so that we can see it and understand what is involved. This is all the more necessary because the draft resolution to which the representative of India referred was not adopted unanimously.

Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): We have listened with interest to the suggestions made by the representatives of India and Nigeria. I think it would be well, if it is the wish of the full Conference, to have Mr. Trivedi's suggestion in writing so that the co-Chairmen can consider it.

As to the date suggested by Mr. Obi, we have no objection to that. I think the other co-Chairman and I have agreed that it is our intention under the present language to meet as early as possible after the disarmament discussions in New York in order that the Conference re-convene here as soon as possible. The United States has no objection to the kind of addition that has been suggested; but I think it is clear that it was the intent in the report that the re-convening should be arranged "as soon as possible", since that is the present wording of the recommended draft report. However, I am sure that the two co-Chairmen can discuss this point once more and, I hope, report to this meeting tomorrow on all the suggestions which have been made.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania) (translation from French): I hope that the representative of India will find it possible to submit his amendment in writing.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I merely wish to stress that, after the explanations given by Mr. Obi, who said that he spoke on behalf of the eight non-aligned delegations, after my support for his proposal and after Mr. Foster's

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

intervention, it is clear that Mr. Obi's proposal is supported by the majority of the delegations here present. In these circumstances, I should merely like to request the two co-Chairmen to consider this particular point.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

As co-Chairman I have not yet expressed my opinion on any of the amendments that have been submitted. But I see that the discussion is developing in the direction of having us settle at once the questions raised in one or the other amendment. That seems to us to be rather hasty and premature. But since that is the direction the matter is taking, permit me to express our opinion regarding those amendments.

I agree with my co-Chairman, Mr. Foster, that the suggestion made by the representative of Nigeria, Mr. Obi, regarding the date of the re-convening of the Committee does not give rise to any objection on the part either of the Soviet co-Chairman or of the United States co-Chairman. But, as the Committee knows, the drafting of a report is a rather complicated process involving responsibilities. The co-Chairmen have displayed great industry, tenacity and energy in order to ensure that the various points of view should be reflected in the report, and to avoid creating in the text itself any occasion for controversies or disagreements which might prolong the discussion of this question in the Committee.

For this reason agreement was reached between the two co-Chairmen that it should be indicated in the report, as was done on previous occasions, that the date of the resumption of the Committee's work would be determined by the co-Chairmen after the General Assembly had finished consideration of disarmament questions and after consultation with the other members of the Committee. Of course, the co-Chairmen will take into account the opinions which have been expressed here on that subject by the non-aligned States, as the representative of Nigeria has done today, as well as other considerations.

It seems to us that, in order to facilitate and accelerate our work, it would be appropriate to limit ourselves to the point that the opinion of the non-aligned States, which has been expressed by the representative of Nigeria on their behalf, will be reflected in the records of the Committee, in the verbatim records of today's meeting. Undoubtedly the co-Chairmen, when fixing the date of the resumption of the Committee's work, will take that opinion into account.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

However, we do not see any ground for changing the established practice in fixing the date of the re-convening of the Committee. Perhaps the representatives of the non-aligned countries will explain what is involved. Why has there suddenly arisen the question of fixing the date of the resumption of the Committee's work by a decision of the Committee? Now a new procedure is suddenly being suggested. Have some special reasons cropped up? Then let us have an exchange of views on whether the Committee itself should take a decision on this question.

Mr. OBI (Nigeria): I should merely like to say that it is not possible for me to interpret the reasons why the non-aligned countries decided to suggest this. I only wish to observe, personally, that this is not an unusual request to make. If my memory serves me aright, we had this trouble in 1962, and on that occasion we had a recommendation from the co-Chairmen that we should re-convene as soon as possible and in any case not later than seven days after the end of the discussion of disarmament in the First Committee. By implication, therefore, we have a tradition of fixing a firm date.

Of course we did not observe that precedent at our last session when we adjourned on 17 September 1964; but, with all due respect, I do not agree with our Soviet co-Chairman that this is a new development at all. It is something which has happened before. I am sure that his memory will recall to him that in 1962 we had a recommendation from the two co-Chairmen that we should re-convene as soon as possible and in any case not later than seven days after the termination of the discussion of disarmament in the First Committee.

Lord CHALFONT (United Kingdom): As the representative of the Soviet Union has suggested that we might discuss this matter and has asked for comments on it, I should like to make a brief comment on the proposal put forward by Mr. Obi on behalf of the eight non-aligned countries. With the greatest respect to our Soviet co-Chairman, I feel that we should not allow established practice to influence our thoughts on this matter too much. It is possible to argue, and indeed I have argued in the past, that we are now passing through a time when matters of arms control and disarmament are of greater urgency, greater immediacy, than they may have been in the past.

I therefore wish to say on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation that I have very great sympathy for the view put forward by Mr. Obi on behalf of the eight. I do not believe that this has detracted in any way from the prerogative of the co-Chairmen in

(Lord Chalfont, United Kingdom)

deciding the date of re-convening the Committee; it seems to me simply to indicate the feeling of urgency of the non-aligned countries. I share that feeling of urgency. I was pleased to hear that my Italian colleague and my United States colleague shared it too. There seems to be in this Committee, if not a complete consensus, at least a great weight of opinion that the report should reflect the feeling of urgency that we all have. I therefore believe that the wording proposed by Mr. Obi, or something very like it, while reflecting this sense of urgency is sufficiently flexible to allow the prerogative of fixing the actual date to remain with the co-Chairmen; and I should like formally to record my support for the proposal made by Mr. Obi.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 233rd plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. V. Dumitrescu, representative of Romania.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Mexico, the United States, the United Arab Republic, Italy, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, India and Nigeria.

"The delegations of Brazil, Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and the United Arab Republic tabled a joint memorandum on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and a joint memorandum on a comprehensive test ban treaty.<sup>1/</sup>

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 16 September 1965, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Circulated respectively as ENDC/158 and 159.